

To: Wooster, Richard[Wooster.Richard@epa.gov]
Cc: Dwyer, Stacey[Dwyer.Stacey@epa.gov]; Shaikh, Taimur[Shaikh.Taimur@epa.gov]; Medrano, Selena[Medrano.Selena@epa.gov]; Larsen, Brent[Larsen.Brent@epa.gov]; Garcia, David[Garcia.David@epa.gov]
From: Honker, William
Sent: Wed 6/7/2017 9:34:56 PM
Subject: RE: A Couple Follow-Ups Stacey Requested I Complete While She is Out

On Illinois, next week please put together a short write-up on the Tenkiller path forward and timeline that I can give to Sam. Maybe we can then move out on the watershed model.

Bill

William K. Honker, P.E.
Director, Water Division
EPA Region 6
1445 Ross Ave., Suite 1200
Dallas, TX 75202
214-665-3187

From: Wooster, Richard
Sent: Wednesday, June 07, 2017 3:45 PM
To: Honker, William <honker.william@epa.gov>
Cc: Dwyer, Stacey <Dwyer.Stacey@epa.gov>; Shaikh, Taimur <Shaikh.Taimur@epa.gov>; Medrano, Selena <Medrano.Selena@epa.gov>; Larsen, Brent <Larsen.Brent@epa.gov>
Subject: A Couple Follow-Ups Stacey Requested I Complete While She is Out

Bill – Before leaving, Stacey asked me to follow up with you on a couple subjects. My discussion of those subjects is below:

1. Illinois River Timeline – Taim will return to the R6 Office on Monday and I will work with him to develop another best estimate of timing for our next steps. As Stacey and I have mentioned in earlier briefings, we have been working with EPA Contract Officers to address the short-comings we have noted with respect to the Lake Tenkiller model calibration. Last Friday, we received notice from the CO that the Prime Contractor and its Sub have requested a 90-day “no-cost extension” of the contract performance period so that additional efforts to refine the Lake model calibration can be made. We are in agreement with the CO to grant the request, inasmuch as there will be no additional cost to the Agency. Meanwhile, before he left last month to provide assistance to HQ, Taim launched his own efforts to develop a simplified “Bathtub” model of the Lake. At the time of Taim’s departure, calibration results of the Bathtub model were promising and we will continue pursuing the development and documentation of such model over the next 90 days while the contractors are working to improve their model’s calibration. Additional work will be required at the conclusion of the 90 days, in terms of vetting the model(s) with our technical group and preparing for prospective public meetings in the Fall. Following is a preliminary timeline for our next steps.

- | | |
|---|---|
| - Complete documentation of Bathtub model: | June 30, 2017 |
| - Convene Technical Workgroup meeting:
discuss Bathtub model, Contractor model progress, public meetings | late-July 2017 (resources permitting) – |
| - Receive further Lake model calibration results from Prime Contractor: | September 1, 2017 |
| - Convene Technical Workgroup meeting:
permitting) – discuss Contractor’s lake model, proposed choice of Lake model to use, solidify plans for public meetings | October 11-12, 2017 (resources |
| - Principals’ Call:
scenarios | Mid October – Discuss load reduction |
| - Evaluate load reduction scenarios: | Mid-October – Mid November, 2017 |
| - Public notice of informational meetings: | Mid-November, 2017 |
| - Convene public meetings: | Mid December, 2017 |
| - Close public comment period: | Mid-February, 2018 |
| - Convene Technical Workgroup meeting:
to Watershed and Lake models based on public comment | Early March, 2018 - consider revisions |
| - Principals’ Call:
strategies (TMDLs, Alternatives) for implementing load reductions | Mid/Late March, 2018 – Discuss |
| - Public Notice:
the modeling project and share selected results | Earthday – Announce completion of |

2. Arkansas 303(d) List – As we discussed, the situation in Region 5 regarding OH’s list of impaired waters (and the straight approval action R5 took) is similar in some ways to the situation we face with respect to AR’s several impaired waters list. However, HQ’s OWOW will most certainly be quick to point out substantive differences between the circumstances here and in R5. One of the primary differences is that R5 (OH) is focused on one waterbody while we and AR are dealing with over 4 dozen waterbodies. Another distinction I expect HQ will make is that R5 is in fact confident that OH is taking steps now to actually address the open waters of Lake Erie (their conundrum) whereas we cannot be certain that AR will be able to address 52 waterbodies by 2018. We look forward to our follow-up brief with the Acting RA and ORC next Wednesday.

rich

Richard A. Wooster
Chief, Assessment, Listing and TMDL Section
(214) 665-6473